DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 393 382 HE 029 057

TITLE	Postsecondary Accountability Review: Report and Recommendations of the Florida Postsecondary Education Planning Commission.
INSTITUTION	Florida State Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, Tallahassee.
PUB DATE	Dec 95
NOTE	39p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Accountability; College Instruction; *College Outcomes Assessment; Community Colleges; *Educational Policy; Government School Relationship; Long Range Planning; *Postsecondary Education; Productivity; Public Colleges; Standards; State Programs; State Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*Florida

ABSTRACT

A review of existing accountability processes and reports of the Florida State University System, the State Community College System, and public and independent postsecondary institutions was conducted in compliance with a 1994 Florida legislative mandate. The review centered on priority areas identified in the 1993 Master Plan for Florida Postsecondary Education which were quality of undergraduate education, productivity, and access/diversity. Eleven recommendations were made concerning issues of accountability reporting: (1) site visits to a sample of public institutions; (2) inclusion in accountability reports of alternatives to the College Level Academic Skills Test by community colleges; (3) reporting of instructional productivity by state universities using faculty contact hours by rank; (4) reporting of time-to-degree and credit hours taken beyond degree requirements; (5) phasing in of required measures; (6) identification of nonreporting institutions in order to encourage compliance in accountability reporting; (7) inclusion of the Limited Access Competitive Grant Program in accountability reports; (8) response to multiple accountability-related initiatives; (9) integration of performance-based budgeting and statutory accountability reporting; (10) presentation of reports in an accessible and understandable format; and (11) establishment of system goals. Seven appendices provide additional supporting documentation such as accountability reporting requirements, statutory references for accountability, and sample indicators of quality in undergraduate education. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 393 382

POSTSECONDARY ACCOUNTABILITY REVIEW

Report and Recommendations of the Florida Postsecondary Education Planning Commission

HE029057

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Florida Postsecondary Education Planning Com
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

December 1995

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PLANNING COMMISSION

H. Clyde Hobby, Chairman
New Port Richey

Richard C. Alterman
Opa Locka

Inez W. Bailey
Niceville

Ivie R. Burch
Panama City

Sally I. Gillespie
New Smyrna Beach

Thomas J. Haynes
Tallahassee

James E. Kirk, Jr.
Ocala

Robert B. Mautz
Gainesville

Earl E. Olden
Tallahassee

Karen L. Plunkett
Orlando

Edgar E. Tolle
Crystal River

Mark K. Wheeler
St. Augustine

William B. Proctor, Executive Director

The Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, initially created by executive order in 1980, given statutory authority in 1981 (SS 240.145 and 240.147, Florida Statutes), and reauthorized by the 1991 Legislature, serves as a citizen board to coordinate the efforts of postsecondary institutions and provide independent policy analyses and recommendations to the State Board of Education and the Legislature. The Commission is composed of 11 members of the general public and one full-time student registered at a postsecondary education institution in Florida. Members are appointed by the Governor with the approval of three members of the State Board of Education and subject to confirmation by the Senate.

The major responsibility of the Commission is preparing and updating every five years a master plan for postsecondary education. The enabling legislation provides that the Plan "shall include consideration of the promotion of quality, fundamental educational goals, programmatic access, needs for remedial education, regional and state economic development, international education programs, demographic patterns, student demand for programs, needs of particular subgroups of the population, implementation of innovative educational techniques and technology, and the requirements of the labor market. The capacity of existing programs, in both public and independent institutions, to respond to identified needs shall be evaluated and a plan shall be developed to respond efficiently to unmet needs."

Other responsibilities include recommending to the State Board of Education program contracts with independent institutions; advising the State Board regarding the need for and location of new programs, branch campuses and centers of public postsecondary education institutions; periodically reviewing the accountability processes and reports of the public and independent postsecondary sectors; reviewing public postsecondary education budget requests for compliance with the State Master Plan; and periodically conducting special studies, analyses, and evaluations related to specific postsecondary education issues and programs.

Further information about the Commission, its publications, meetings and other activities may be obtained from the Commission office, 224 Collins Building, Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida, 32399-0400; telephone (904) 488-7894; FAX (904) 922-5388.

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PLANNING COMMISSION

POSTSECONDARY ACCOUNTABILITY REVIEW

Prepared in Response to Specific Appropriation 198
of the
1995 General Appropriations Act
Chapter 95-429, Laws of Florida

December 12, 1995

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY i

INTRODUCTION 1

REVIEW METHOD 2

SUMMARY OF 1994 PLANS AND REPORTS 3

SYSTEM-LEVEL PERFORMANCE IN ADDRESSING STATE PRIORITIES 4

ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS 7

APPENDICES

A -Accountability Reporting Requirements, by Sector A-1

B -Goals Contained in Public Postsecondary System Master Plans B-1

C -Statutory References for Accountability C-1

D -Accountability Review Schedule, State Universities and Community Colleges D-1

E -Accountability Process for Limited Access Competitive Grant Program E-1

F -Example Questions for Use in Accountability-Related Site Visits F-1

G -Sample Indicators of Quality in Undergraduate Education G-1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Legislative Charge

In 1994, the Florida Legislature revised the Commission's statutory authority with regard to accountability, directing the Commission to:

> *Periodically review the design and implementation of the accountability processes and reports of the State University System, State Community College System, and public and independent postsecondary institutions. At least every 5 years, evaluate the extent to which each plan is contributing to the achievement of state goals for postsecondary education and report to the State Board of Education, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with recommendations on any changes needed in the accountability process or plans. (Section 240.147, Florida Statutes)*

Additionally, proviso language accompanying Specific Appropriation 198 of the 1995 General Appropriations Act directed the Commission to continue its accountability review, assessing the degree to which institutional and system goals relate to state priorities.

State Accountability Priorities

In ***Challenges, Realities, Strategies: The Master Plan for Florida Postsecondary Education for the 21st Century*** (1993), the Commission endorsed targeting a few priorities as a strategy for dealing with the fiscal realities that constrain accountability expectations. After a review of all current postsecondary master plans in Florida and the strategic plans of the Department of Education and the Office of the Governor, the Commission identified three themes which cut across postsecondary sectors: quality of undergraduate education, productivity, and access/diversity. These priority areas provide the focus for the Commission's review.

Annual and Summative Reviews

The Commission's review process follows a two-tier approach. Annual reviews over four years focus on the design and implementation of the accountability processes and reports of both public systems. For purposes of the review, the 1994 system and institutional accountability plans and reports are the primary resource documents. Annual review questions examine the relationship between accountability and continual improvement in a sample of state universities and community colleges diverse in size, mission, and location. A secondary purpose of the annual review is to report current public and independent sector performance on key indicators related to the statewide accountability priorities. A fifth-year summative review to be conducted in 1999 will assess system-wide progress with regard to the state priority areas.

1994 Accountability Plans and Reports

In its two previous reports on accountability, the Commission espoused that accountability serves dual purposes—to aid in institutional improvement and to provide the Legislature and the public with information about system progress in addressing statewide priorities. The community colleges have allowed for these dual purposes of accountability by providing two sections in each institutional accountability report: a section to report data related to the

measures in statute and a supplemental section that allows institutions to report goals, activities, and data related to institution-specific measures. One of the purposes stated in the Community College System 1994 Accountability Plan is "the establishment of a viable process that allows the institutions to assess and improve their quality and effectiveness." From the institutional accountability documents reviewed, the Commission believes the community colleges to be achieving that purpose. In contrast to the State Board of Community Colleges, the Board of Regents no longer requires institutions to submit an annual accountability plan. In the future, individual universities will not submit separate accountability reports, but will provide data for the systemwide report. It was not possible from a review of documents, therefore, to assess the degree to which universities are using accountability for institutional improvement. This will be the focus of accountability-related site visits to a sample of universities and community colleges in future years.

Issues and Recommendations

The Commission identified several issues in conjunction with this study and made recommendations intended to improve the accountability process. Certain issues that affect each postsecondary sector individually are followed by accountability issues that cut across sector lines.

Commission's Review Method

Issue: Site Visits

Recommendation:

1. ***The Commission should supplement future analyses of an annual sample of public institution accountability plans, processes, and reports with site visits to the universities in each sample and two community colleges, in order to further assess their use of the accountability process for institutional improvement.***

Community Colleges

Issue: CLAST Alternatives

Recommendation:

2. ***As alternatives to the CLAST are developed pursuant to CS/HB 821, the Community College System should develop accountability measures that supplement student CLAST pass rates with the number and percentage of students exempting the CLAST via each alternative.***

State Universities

Issue: Reporting of Instructional Productivity

Recommendation:

3. ***State University System data with regard to instructional contact hours should be reported in a manner that allows for an analysis of faculty instructional activities by rank across lower undergraduate, upper undergraduate, and graduate levels.***

Issue: Time-to-Degree Reporting

Recommendation:

4. ***State University System accountability reporting with regard to time to degree should include, by institution, the average number of credit hours taken beyond degree requirements.***

Issue: Phasing in of Measures

Independent Institutions

Recommendation:

5. ***Beginning with its 1994-95 Accountability Report, the ICUF institutions should include data on all indicators that were optional in 1993-94 while data collection on a common student cohort was being phased in.***

Issue: Institution-Level Data

Recommendation:

6. ***ICUF should continue to seek full institutional participation in accountability reporting. To aid in interpretation of reported data, any non-reporting institutions should be listed with each indicator. Individual institutional data should appear in appendices of the ICUF Accountability Report.***

Issue: Limited Access Competitive Grant Program

Recommendation:

7. ***Future ICUF Accountability Reports should contain data for the accountability measures in Appendix E related to the Limited Access Competitive Grant Program.***

Issue: Responding to Multiple Accountability-Related Initiatives

Accountability Issues That Cross Sectors

Recommendation:

8. ***Section 240.214 (1), Florida Statutes, should be revised to read "...The annual accountability report shall include goals and measurable objectives related to the system-wide strategic ~~master~~ plan pursuant to s. 240.209. The report ~~plan~~ must include, at a minimum, system-wide performance targets, measures, and data ~~objectives~~ related to the following issues ~~measures~~:***
(a) Undergraduate teaching productivity and class size; ~~Total student credit hours;~~
(b) Access and diversity; ~~Total number of contact hours of instruction produced by faculty, by institution, rank, and course level;~~

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(c) Baccalaureate degree retention and graduation; ~~Pass rates on professional licensure examinations, by institution;~~
(d) Progression to the baccalaureate degree; ~~Institutional quality as assessed by follow-up, such as analyses of employment information on former students, national rankings, and surveys of alumni, parents, clients, and employers;~~
(e) Research; ~~Length of time and number of academic credits required to complete an academic degree, by institution and by degree;~~
(f) Public service; and ~~Enrollment, progression, retention, and graduation rates by race and gender;~~
(g) Institutional quality. ~~Student course demand;~~
~~(h) An analysis of administrative and support functions;~~
~~(i) Every 3 years, beginning 1995-96, an analysis of the cumulative debt of students; and~~
~~(j) An evaluation of the production of classroom contact hours at each university in comparison to a standard of 12 contact hours per term or 32 contact hours per year for each full-time instructional position and the level of funding provided for instruction.~~"

Issue: Integrating Performance-Based Budgeting and Statutory Accountability Reporting

Recommendation:

9. To the extent possible, measures used by public postsecondary education systems for accountability reporting should be consistent with those used for performance-based budgeting.

Issue: Reporting in Accessible and Understandable Format

Recommendation:

10. Each system-level accountability report should provide a system-wide summary for every measure contained in the institutional accountability reports. The SUS and ICUF accountability reports should summarize the results of institutional surveys of students, alumni, and/or employers, achieving this by limiting institutions to brief executive summaries of institutional survey processes and results.

Issue: Goal Setting

Recommendation:

11. The State University System Accountability Plan should establish system goals in terms of benchmarks to peer systems or improvement from baseline performance, with target dates for goal realization. The Community College System Accountability Plan should substitute the specific target year in place of current reference to "five year goals" in the plan.

INTRODUCTION

Legislative Charge

In 1994, the Florida Legislature revised the Commission's statutory authority with regard to accountability, directing the Commission to:

> *Periodically review the design and implementation of the accountability processes and reports of the State University System, State Community College System, and public and independent postsecondary institutions. At least every 5 years, evaluate the extent to which each plan is contributing to the achievement of state goals for postsecondary education and report to the State Board of Education, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with recommendations on any changes needed in the accountability process or plans. (see Appendix C; Section 240.147, Florida Statutes)*

Additionally, proviso language accompanying Specific Appropriation 198 of the 1995 General Appropriations Act directed the Commission to continue its accountability review, assessing the degree to which institutional and system goals relate to state priorities.

Commission Activities

The Commission Chairman appointed a Finance/Administration Committee, chaired by Dr. Richard Alterman, to direct this study. Other Committee members were Inez Bailey, Thomas Haynes, James Kirk, and Earl Olden. The Committee discussed the study four times between May and December 1995 and received public testimony. In addition to reviewing system and institution accountability plans and reports, Commission staff had conversations with sector board staff, legislative staff, and institutional representatives and attended meetings of the State University System and Community College System on accountability and performance-based budgeting. The Commission gratefully acknowledges the cooperation of staff from the Board of Regents, the State Board of Community Colleges, and the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida.

State Accountability Priorities

In ***Challenges, Realities, Strategies: The Master Plan for Florida Postsecondary Education for the 21st Century*** (1993), the Commission endorsed targeting a few priorities as a strategy for dealing with the fiscal realities that constrain accountability expectations. After a review of all current postsecondary master plans in Florida and the strategic plans of the Department of Education and the Office of the Governor, the Commission's 1993 report, ***Accountability in Florida's Postsecondary Education System***, identified three themes which cut across postsecondary sectors: quality of undergraduate education, productivity, and access/diversity. These priority areas also align with the State Comprehensive Plan's goal statement for education (Section 187.201, Florida Statutes). The priority areas provide the focus for the Commission's review.

Accountability Reporting Requirements

The 1994 State University System (SUS) Accountability Report responds to 10 measures in statute (see Appendix C; Section 240.214, Florida Statutes)

Public Sector

and includes various other measures emanating from eight planning directives contained in the 1993-1998 SUS Master Plan (Appendix B), for a total of 50 measures.

The five statewide measures in the 1994 Community College System (CCS) Accountability Plan are also contained in statute (see Appendix C; Section 240.324, Florida Statutes), and focus exclusively on student outcomes. The measures are derived from eight planning directives in the CCS Master Plan (Appendix B) and are aligned with the broader goals found in the community colleges' statutory mission (Section 240.301, Florida Statutes).

Independent Sector

At the direction of the 1994 Legislature, the Commission consulted with independent institutions that participate in the Florida Resident Access Grant (FRAG) program to recommend accountability measures and a process for those institutions (see Appendix C; Section 240.147, Florida Statutes). The institutions that participate in the FRAG are the 22 four-year, SACS accredited members of the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida (ICUF) and the University of Miami. The 12 indicators used by these independent institutions for accountability reporting are displayed in Appendix A, along with the measures currently in statute for the state universities and community colleges.

REVIEW METHOD

As set forth in the ***Accountability Review: Progress Report***, the Commission's review process follows a two-tier approach. Annual reviews over four years focus on the design and implementation of the accountability processes and reports of both public systems. For purposes of the review, the 1994 system and institutional accountability plans and reports are the primary resource documents. Annual review questions examine the relationship between accountability and continual improvement in public institution effectiveness. A secondary purpose of the annual review is to report current public and independent sector performance on key indicators related to the statewide accountability priorities — quality of undergraduate education, productivity, and access/diversity. A fifth-year summative review to be conducted in 1999 will assess system-wide progress with regard to the state priority areas.

Annual and Summative Reviews

Selection of Institutions for Annual Review

Each annual review is based on a sample of state universities and community colleges diverse in size, mission, and location (Appendix D). The sampling process will allow the accountability plans and reports of all public institutions to be reviewed over a four-year period. This document reports results of the first of the Commission's annual reviews. Representatives of the Board of Regents and the State Board of Community Colleges assisted in placing their institutions in the review schedule. Institutions selected for review of 1993-94 accountability reports were Florida State University (FSU), the University of Central Florida (UCF), and the following community colleges: Broward, Gulf Coast, Indian River, Lake City, Polk, St. Petersburg, and South Florida.

SUMMARY OF 1994 PLANS AND REPORTS

In its two previous reports on accountability, the Commission espoused that accountability serves dual purposes—to aid in institutional improvement and to provide the Legislature and the public with information about system progress in addressing statewide priorities. With regard to the first purpose, a statewide accountability process is beneficial but not sufficient. State accountability data should certainly be part of an institution's overall assessment and improvement plan. An institution's long-range strategic planning, however, must of necessity incorporate detailed institution-level data that would be inappropriate for a state-level accountability program.

Community Colleges

The community colleges have allowed for these dual purposes of accountability by providing two sections in each institutional accountability report: a section to report data related to the measures in statute and a supplemental section that allows institutions to report goals, activities, and data related to institution-specific measures. One of the purposes stated in the Community College System 1994 Accountability Plan is "the establishment of a viable process that allows the institutions to assess and improve their quality and effectiveness." Institution-specific measures contained in the institutional plans sampled relate to areas such as faculty productivity, continuing education, and the increased use of educational technology in instruction. Indian River Community College's Strategic Plan to Improve Institutional Effectiveness provides an exemplary model for integrating the state's accountability initiative with institutional efforts toward continual improvement.

Each community college plan, following a format devised by the State Board of Community Colleges' Committee on Accountability and Effectiveness, demonstrates how institutional goals support the Community College System Master Plan goals and, in turn, the community colleges' statutory mission. The Community College System Accountability Plan has set quantitative five-year goals for the system with regard to each statutory measure, and each institution is required to set five-year goals for itself. An institution might currently be performing above the system goal on one measure and below the system goal on another. Each institution has also enumerated activities it is undertaking in order to achieve its goals with regard to the statutory and institution-specific measures.

Although it is difficult to accurately assess the degree of constituent involvement by reading the plans, each community college plan in the sample reported faculty, administration, and student participation in goal-setting, assessment, data review, and redirection of institutional efforts. South Florida Community College reported that while a central committee provides coordination and quality control over planning processes, nearly 60 percent of all employees participate in institutional planning processes in some way. All but two of the seven community college plans indicated some process by which constituents external to the institution were also involved in the planning process. Lake City Community College has established an Advisory Committee for each educational program area composed of business, academic, and gov-

ernment representatives. The Commission's review of a sample of institutional plans revealed that accountability data are evaluated and fed back into future planning through a variety of mechanisms.

State Universities

The State University System has taken a different approach to responding to the accountability legislation. In contrast to the State Board of Community Colleges, the Board of Regents no longer requires institutions to submit an annual accountability plan. The Board of Regents' Accountability Committee, consisting of board staff and institutional representatives, provides oversight and direction to the process, and institutions provide data in response to the measures. Where data were of a qualitative or non-standard nature, the 1994 State University System Accountability Report referred the reader to individual institutional reports. In the future, individual institutional accountability reports will no longer be required.

SYSTEM-LEVEL PERFORMANCE IN ADDRESSING STATE PRIORITIES

The following section presents data reflecting current public and independent sector performance on indicators related to state accountability priorities—quality of undergraduate education, productivity, and access/diversity. The public sector data are sampled from measures in statute; the independent sector data are related to the measures recommended by the Commission. In cases where the SUS report did not aggregate systemwide data, the FSU and UCF reports were consulted as examples. Although not intended to be exhaustive, this section gives a flavor of the kinds of data contained in the sector-level reports.

Quality of Undergraduate Education

State Universities

- At FSU, 1988-89 bachelor's degree recipients were surveyed three years after graduation as to their satisfaction with their education at FSU and the quality of education in their academic department. Ninety-five percent said they would attend FSU again if they could repeat their undergraduate education, up from 92 percent in the class of 1980-81. Eighty-nine percent rated the quality of instruction in their department as excellent or good, while only 1.3 percent said it was poor.
- Of graduating seniors surveyed at UCF, 92 percent said they would recommend UCF to a friend; 89 percent reported that their academic experience was either excellent or good.
- Employers rated approximately 50 percent of UCF graduates they had hired as "superior" or "above average."
- According to the Department of Business and Professional Regulation, SUS average passing rates on professional licensing examinations ranged from a low of 64 percent (out of 1,282 Engineering Intern examinees) to a high of 100 percent (out of 2 Marriage and Family Therapy examinees). The overall pass rate for 16 disciplines reported was 79 percent.
- The 1992-93 pass rate for SUS graduates on all teacher certification subject area examinations was 96 percent, and 99.6 percent on the Professional Education section of the Florida Teacher Certification Examination (FTCE).

- In a recent survey of school principals in counties where graduates of FSU's College of Education are known to be employed, 59 percent of FSU graduates were rated as above average teachers, and 37 percent were rated average. Only two percent were rated below average.

Community Colleges

- Eighty-seven percent of all students who took licensure examinations passed. The CCS goal is 90 percent.
- There was a 63 percent CLAST pass rate among AA degree-seeking students with 60 credit hours who had completed a college preparatory program, 86 percent for students who were not placed in a college preparatory program. The CCS goals are 68 and 90 percent, respectively.
- Among AA-degreed transfers in the SUS, 87 percent had at least a 2.0 GPA during the year following transfer, 68 percent had at least a 2.5 GPA, and 43 percent had at least a 3.0 GPA. The CCS goal is for at least 70 percent of the AA graduates who have transferred to a state university perform at or above a 2.5 GPA.

Independent Institutions

- Based on data for only 6 of the 23 institutions, the independents' pass rate on the FTCE Professional Education examination was 98.8 percent, and 77 percent on teacher certification subject area examinations overall.
- The independent institutions identified class size as an indicator of quality. Average undergraduate course section size in Fall 1994 was 19. 83 percent of all undergraduate course sections contained fewer than 30 students, and the largest single undergraduate course section in any reporting independent institution was 214.
- Specialized accreditation or re-accreditation was granted for 19 of 21 academic programs that sought it in 1993-94 and is pending for the other two programs.
- Responses from surveys of students, alumni, and employers as to institutional quality were unavailable in the inaugural independent report.

Productivity

State Universities

- The percentage of continuing FTIC students graduating within four years has increased from 21 percent to 25 percent from the Fall 1984 cohort to the Fall 1989 cohort.
- The six-year graduation rate for the Fall 1988 FTIC cohort was 48 percent.
- The percentage of community college AA transfer students graduating within two years increased from 16 percent with the Fall 1984 cohort to 36 percent with the Fall 1990 cohort.

Community Colleges

- Retained or graduated 61 percent of the Fall 1990 FTIC AA degree-seeking cohort and 63 percent of the Fall 1990 FTIC AS degree-seeking cohort. The CCS goal is 70 percent.
- Eighty-three percent of the students who completed a vocational program were placed in an occupation related to their field. The CCS goal is 90 percent.

Independent Institutions

- Based on data from only six of the 23 institutions, 33 percent of the 1988 FTIC cohort had graduated with a baccalaureate degree four yearlater, and 54 percent were graduated or still enrolled. The six year graduation rate of the cohort was 47 percent.
- Seventy-six percent of all undergraduate sections are taught by regular full-time faculty, and 59 percent are taught by full, associate, or assistant professors. 24 percent of undergraduate sections are taught by supplemental faculty such as adjuncts and teaching assistants.
- Based on 1988 FTIC cohort data from 10 of the 23 institutions, students averaged only 6.8 more semester hours to graduate than the mean required in the catalog and had an average time to degree of 4.3 academic years.

Access and Diversity

- The SUS reclassified 22 limited access programs as open access programs, and 58 programs expanded, resulting in approximately 1300 more seats in high demand majors at the undergraduate level.

State Universities

- Using student demand data from students' attempts to register by touch-tone telephone for full course sections in Spring and Summer 1994, FSU opened 600 additional course sections to meet demand for Fall 1994.
- While the four-year graduation rates of alternatively admitted FTIC students has remained relatively constant (around 9 percent) over the past four years, the six-year graduation rates for these students increased from 27 percent to 34 percent from the 1984 cohort to the 1988 cohort.
- FSU and UCF both reported increases in the percentage of upper division undergraduate enrollment represented by Black, Hispanic, Asian, and Native American students from Fall 1992 to Fall 1993.

Community Colleges

- Community college enrollments closely mirror the racial/ethnic distribution of the previous year's public high school graduates; a slightly greater percentage of community college students are Hispanic, and a slightly lower percentage are Black.
- Slightly under two-thirds of the students who tested into and enrolled in College Prep Reading and Writing had completed the highest level related college preparatory course within two years. Of students who tested into and enrolled in College Prep Math, 46 percent had successfully completed the highest level College Prep Math course within two years.

Independent Institutions

- Among full-time transfer students with an AA degree from a community college with whom the institution had an articulation agreement, 100 percent gained immediate access to their chosen field of study. 38 percent of those students had graduated with their baccalaureate degree two years later, and 65 percent had graduated three years later. (Note: The graduation rate data are based on reports from only six of the 23 institutions that participate in the FRAG program.)
- The independents' report contains a faculty profile by rank, gender, and race as a diversity measure supplemental to the productivity measure of faculty teaching load. Of total faculty, 72 percent are men, 80 percent are

white, 8 percent are Hispanic, and 5 percent are Black non-Hispanic. Among tenured faculty, 80 percent are male and 89 percent are white.

Summary

The data summarized above, sampled from system- or association-level accountability reports, present a snapshot of current public and independent sector performance on indicators related to state accountability priorities. The SUS Report was the only one of the three system reports to provide any trend data. The Community College System report was its first to contain actual data. The independents' report was their first ever and was based on incomplete institutional reporting. Even so, these data are a first step in establishing a baseline against which trends in each system's contribution to the realization of statewide priorities may be assessed in the future. This will be the objective of the Commission's fifth-year summative review in 1999.

ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Commission's Review Method

Site Visits

In its ***Accountability Review: Progress Report***, the Commission designed its annual accountability review as a document analysis of public system accountability plans and reports and a sample of public institutions' plans and reports. There are two limitations with this methodology. First, as noted earlier, the Board of Regents no longer requires each university to submit an annual accountability plan. Second, even though community college plans describe the integration of accountability and other institutional planning efforts, it is difficult from a document analysis to evaluate the extent to which accountability is viewed by various campus constituents as a vehicle for institutional improvement, as opposed to being an add-on activity. The extent to which faculty, administration, and students support, are involved in, and benefit from the accountability process is not clear from a document review.

A 1995 Education Commission of the States report, ***Making Quality Count in Undergraduate Education***, asserts that since judgments about quality are not always quantifiable, measures of quality are inadequate without direct observation. While care should be taken not to make site visits burdensome, one-day site visits by teams consisting of Commission, BOR, and SBCC staff could assess accountability's role in institutional improvement on a sample of campuses and enable the Commission to submit a more complete and better-informed review. Site visits would also give the Commission the opportunity to interview faculty and students about the effect of recent legislative initiatives to increase instructional productivity, shorten degree requirements, and decrease student credits earned in excess of degree requirements. A listing of example site visit questions is contained in Appendix F.

The Commission's future accountability reviews will utilize information from site visits and document reviews to arrive at recommendations addressed to the purveyors of accountability information as to how the process might be improved. This document will be accompanied by a brief consumer-oriented piece that graphically presents data across postsecondary delivery systems

reflecting system-level performance in addressing statewide accountability priorities.

Recommendation:

1. ***The Commission should supplement future analyses of an annual sample of public institution accountability plans, processes, and reports with site visits to the universities in each sample and two community colleges, in order to further assess their use of the accountability process for institutional improvement.***

Community Colleges

CLAST Alternatives

Since 1982, the College Level Academic Skills Test (CLAST) has been the state's primary measure of students' readiness to progress to upper division academic work. In 1995, CS/HB 821, the "Robert H. McCabe CLAST and Other Skills Act," revised the requirement that every student must pass the CLAST as a condition of earning an AA degree or of entering the upper division of a university. Beginning January 1, 1996, a student will be exempted from taking the test by:

- meeting a minimum score on a nationally standardized examination listed in the articulation agreement.
- passing the college placement test and earning a grade point average of at least 3.0 on certain college preparatory high school courses to be recommended by the Articulation Coordinating Committee
- passing the college placement test and earning a grade point average of at least 2.5 on postsecondary level coursework to be recommended by the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission.

The Community College System accountability statute currently calls for a measure of student performance on the CLAST, which the Community College System Accountability Plan addresses by reporting the number and percent of students who have completed 60 or more college credits and have met the CLAST passing standards.

Recommendation:

2. ***As alternatives to the CLAST are developed pursuant to CS/HB 821, the Community College System should develop accountability measures that supplement student CLAST pass rates with the number and percentage of students exempting the CLAST via each alternative.***

State Universities

Reporting of Instructional Productivity

In ***Challenges, Realities, Strategies: The Master Plan for Florida Postsecondary Education for the 21st Century,*** the Commission noted that reward systems in higher education do not adequately recognize or compensate teaching activity, resulting in reduced faculty participation in teaching. The ***Master Plan*** also reported that 50 percent of lower level instructional contact hours

are generated by adjuncts, teaching assistants, and other part-time instructional staff. The Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability's ***Assessment of the Revised State University System Accountability Plan*** (1994) indicated that only 27 percent of the full-time faculty in the university system produced 12 or more instruction contact hours in the Fall 1993 semester. While the State University System accountability legislation (Section 240.214, Florida Statutes) calls for a reporting of the "total number of contact hours of instruction produced by faculty, by institution, rank, and course level," the 1994 SUS Accountability Report did not respond to this requirement.

Recommendation:

3. ***State University System data regarding instructional contact hours should be reported in a manner that allows for an analysis of faculty instructional activities by rank across lower undergraduate, upper undergraduate, and graduate levels.***

Time-To-Degree Reporting

The State University System accountability legislation also calls for a reporting of the "length of time and number of academic credits required to complete an academic degree, by institution and by degree." The wording of this measure leaves its intent subject to interpretation. Measure 12 of the 1994 SUS Accountability Report addresses this requirement by providing an inventory of SUS baccalaureate degree programs with credit hour requirements within or above an acceptable range of 120-128 credit hours to the degree. However, recent legislative interest with regard to credit hours taken by students in.excess of those required for the degree would seem to call for a more complete response that addresses not only program requirements, but actual credits taken by students in pursuit of the degree. Furthermore, the universities would be best served by disaggregating credit hours earned at the institution from which the student graduated from credit hours amassed at other institutions.

Recommendation:

4. ***State University System accountability reporting with regard to time to degree should include, by institution, the average number of credit hours taken beyond degree requirements.***

Independent Institutions

Phasing in of Measures

Reporting on certain measures that required student cohort tracking was optional in the inaugural ICUF Accountability Report, as institutions were given time to phase in data collection on a common student cohort. Therefore, the measures on time to degree, accumulated student debt, FTIC retention and graduation rates, and transfer student graduation rate had very low response rates—roughly one fourth of all institutions.

Recommendation:

5. ***Beginning with its 1994-95 Accountability Report, the ICUF institutions should include data on all indicators that were optional in 1993-94 while data collection on a common student cohort was being phased in.***

Institution-Level Data

Even on measures that were fully operational for the 1993-94 reporting year, the inaugural ICUF Accountability Report showed that less than 100 percent of institutions (20 out of 23) provided data in a manner consistent enough that it could be compiled with that of other institutions. The Commission's ***Accountability Review: Progress Report***, concluded that individual institutional data should be included in appendices of the ICUF Accountability Report, but no institutional data were appended to the inaugural report.

Recommendation:

6. ***The independent sector should continue to seek full institutional participation in accountability reporting. To aid in interpretation of reported data, any non-reporting institutions should be listed with each indicator. Individual institutional data should appear in appendices of the independent sector Accountability Report.***

Limited Access Competitive Grant Program

The 1995 Legislature, as part of its "Higher Education Access 2000 Act," enacted a limited access competitive grant program to provide enrollment opportunities in the independent sector for qualified community college graduates and state university students who are Florida residents and who, because of a lack of space, are unable to obtain admission to selected state university limited access programs or equivalent academic tracks (Section 240.6045, Florida Statutes). As directed by the Legislature, the Commission recommended certain baccalaureate programs directly related to high priority employment fields for inclusion in the program, and the Commission's recommendations were subsequently approved by the State Board of Education. The Legislature also instructed the Commission, in consultation with the Board of Regents, the State Board of Community Colleges, ICUF, and the State Board of Education, to recommend an accountability process for the program. The process is to assess the program's benefits and cost-effectiveness and is to make use of existing information submitted by the respective system in conjunction with the establishment of the program. The Commission circulated the accountability measures and process proposed in Appendix E to the above parties and presented its proposal at the September 1995 meeting of the ICUF Presidents Council.

Recommendation:

7. ***Future independent sector Accountability Reports should contain data for the accountability measures in Appendix E related to the Limited Access Competitive Grant Program.***

Accountability Issues That Cross Sectors

Responding to Multiple Accountability-Related Initiatives

In addition to the accountability legislation, the Community College System and the State University System are both currently responding to other legislative accountability-related initiatives. Senate Bill 2330 calls for both public postsecondary sectors to reduce general education requirements to 36 credit hours and requires the universities to standardize prerequisites, designate courses as upper- or lower-level, reduce the baccalaureate degree requirements to 120 hours with a few exceptions, and reduce the number of credits taken by students in excess of those required for a degree. The Instructional Performance Incentive Fund, created in proviso of the 1995 Appropriations Act, provides $15 million for universities to achieve various productivity-related targets. The Commission heard testimony from board representatives that the measures pursuant to each of these initiatives, while similar, are dissimilar enough to require separate data runs and presentation preparation.

The Community College System accountability statute (Section 240.324, Florida Statutes) calls for Community College System Accountability Plan to address five issues. Although the 1994 CCS Plan was its first to include data, each CCS plan has consistently addressed the five statutory issues since 1991. The State University System accountability statute (Section 240.214, Florida Statutes) does not contain "issues" language, but rather calls for the SUS to report on nine specific measures contained in statute. The first two SUS Accountability Reports addressed the statutory measures. The 1994 SUS report had expanded to some 50 measures while omitting a few of the statutory measures. For 1995 accountability reporting, the SUS plans to refocus on far fewer measures (16) relating to nine key objectives that support the universities' tripartite mission of teaching, research, and public service.

The Commission supports the continual refinement of measures, and particularly, the universities' planned addition of measures related to research and public service. The SUS accountability legislation calls for the monitoring of system-level performance in each of the major areas of the university system's tripartite mission—teaching, research, and public service. The Commission is concerned, however, that accountability has become a "moving target" for the institutions and for state-level policymakers attempting to follow system progress over time. An appropriate solution to the "moving target" problem is to remove specific measures from the SUS accountability statute, replacing them with key issues that are aligned with the statewide priority areas identified by the Commission—productivity, access/diversity, and quality of undergraduate education. (Guidance on arriving at indicators of quality is contained in Appendix G.) In return for this added flexibility, the SUS would then be required to include consistent data that are comparable across time to address those issues in each annual accountability report.

Recommendation:

8. ***Section 240.214 (1), Florida Statutes, should be revised to read "...The annual accountability report shall include goals and measurable objec-***

tives related to the system-wide strategic ~~master~~ plan pursuant to s. 240.209. The report ~~plan~~ must include, at a minimum, system-wide performance targets, measures, and data ~~objectives~~ related to the following issues ~~measures:~~

(a) Undergraduate teaching productivity and class size; ~~Total student credit hours;~~

(b) Access and diversity; ~~Total number of contact hours of instruction produced by faculty, by institution, rank, and course level;~~

(c) Baccalaureate degree retention and graduation; ~~Pass rates on professional licensure examinations, by institution;~~

(d) Progression to the baccalaureate degree; ~~Institutional quality as assessed by follow-up, such as analyses of employment information on former students, national rankings, and surveys of alumni, parents, clients, and employers;~~

(e) Research; ~~Length of time and number of academic credits required to complete an academic degree, by institution and by degree;~~

(f) Public service; and ~~Enrollment, progression, retention, and graduation rates by race and gender;~~

(g) Institutional quality. ~~Student course demand;~~

~~(h) An analysis of administrative and support functions;~~

~~(i) Every 3 years, beginning 1995-96, an analysis of the cumulative debt of students; and~~

~~(j) An evaluation of the production of classroom contact hours at each university in comparison to a standard of 12 contact hours per term or 32 contact hours per year for each full-time instructional position and the level of funding provided for instruction.~~"

Integrating Performance-Based Budgeting and Statutory Accountability Reporting

As noted earlier, the completion of accountability plans and reports is only one of the accountability-related activities required of Florida's public postsecondary institutions and systems. Another recent accountability-related initiative is the Government Performance and Accountability Act of 1994, which requires the use of performance budgeting in state agency and budget submissions. The Division of Community Colleges has submitted a draft of performance budgeting measures to accompany its 1996-97 Legislative Budget Request. There is considerable overlap between the CCS accountability measures and the proposed performance budgeting measures. In 1996, the State University System will be required to submit a performance based budget for the 1997-1998 fiscal year.

Performance-based budgeting and the accountability reporting required by statute are similar processes in that both are concerned with demonstrating to various stakeholders the achievement of specified levels of system and institutional performance with regard to effectiveness and efficiency. The processes, however similar, are complementary rather than redundant. While the issues addressed should remain the same, the level of data aggregation is different. Funding decisions at the state level, while based on the compilation of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

unit-level data, require the eventual aggregation of data at a gross level that would be inappropriate for an accountability report. Information disaggregated by institution level, or discipline is the purview of the accountability report.

Recommendation:

9. ***To the extent possible, measures used by public postsecondary education systems for accountability reporting should be consistent with those used for performance-based budgeting.***

Reporting in Accessible and Understandable Format

In *Accountability in Florida's Postsecondary Education System* (1993), the Commission asserted that one characteristic of a state-level accountability process is a report to the public in an accessible and understandable format. Each sector board has the responsibility of compiling large amounts of institutional data that are often diverse in nature. The SUS 1994 Accountability Report often referred the reader to the individual institutional reports in instances where reporting is non-standardized (e.g., results of surveys of alumni or employers) or data are qualitative in nature (e.g., descriptions of institutional efforts to improve teaching). This should become less problematic, as the SUS appears to be moving toward a more quantitative approach to accountability reporting. The independent sector Accountability Report omitted any discussion of surveys of students, alumni, or employers as to institutional quality.

Recommendation:

10. ***Each system-level accountability report should provide a system-wide summary for every measure contained in the institutional accountability reports. The SUS and independent sector accountability reports should summarize the results of institutional surveys of students, alumni, and/or employers, achieving this by limiting institutions to brief executive summaries of institutional survey processes and results.***

Goal Setting

The State University System Revised Accountability Plan indicates that progress with regard to many of the objectives is to be measured by comparing current year to prior year performance. For example, progress on the objective of increasing the percentage of continuing full-time FTIC students graduating in four years is measured by comparing graduation rates to the prior year. Target dates for goal realization are not set. Benchmarking system performance to that of university systems in peer stated identified by the SUS may provide another beneficial means of assessing system performance. The Community College System Accountability Plan establishes five-year goals for system performance at a level just above current performance.

Recommendation:

11. The State University System Accountability Report should establish system goals in terms of benchmarks to peer systems or improvement from baseline performance, with target dates for goal realization. The Community College System Accountability Plan should substitute the specific target year in place of the current reference to "five year goals" in the plan.

APPENDIX A

ACCOUNTABILITY REPORTING REQUIREMENTS,
BY SECTOR

ACCOUNTABILITY REPORTING REQUIREMENTS, BY SECTOR

State Universities, Statute	Community Colleges, Statute	Independent Institutions, Recommended by PEPC
1. Total student credit hours.	1. Graduation rates of AA and AS degree-seeking students compared to first-time enrolled students seeking the associate degree.	1a. Distribution of undergrad. teaching load for full-time faculty, by institution. 1b. Faculty profile by rank, gender, and race/ethnicity.
2. Total number of contact hours of instruction produced by faculty, by institution, rank, and course level.	2. Minority student enrollment and retention rates.	2. Distribution of undergrad. course sections taught by ranked and supplemental faculty, by institution and course level.
3. Pass rates on professional licensure examinations, by institution.	3. Student performance, including student performance rates on college level academic skills tests, mean grade-point averages for community college AA transfer students, and community college student performance on state licensure exams.	3. Number of academic years and academic credits to complete a baccalaureate degree (a) as required in catalog and (b) actually taken by cohort of full-time students, by institution and discipline.
4. Institutional quality as assessed by follow-up, such as analyses of employment information on former students, national rankings, and surveys of alumni, parents, clients, and employers.	4. Job placement rates of community college vocational students.	4. Average debt accumulated by cohort of FRAG recipients in Stafford, Perkins, and institutionally-funded loans upon receipt of baccalaureate degree, by institution.
5. Length of time and number of academic credits required to complete an academic degree, by institution and by degree.	5. Student progression by admission status and program.	5. Average total state cost per Florida resident undergrad. student (a) per academic year and (b) per undergrad. degree, including programs supported by an academic contract with the State, by institution.
6. Enrollment, progression, retention, and graduation rates by race and gender.	6. Other measures as identified by PEPC and approved by the SBCC.	6. Four-, five-, and six-year retention and graduation rates of cohort of first time in college (FTIC) students, by institution, race/ethnicity, and gender.
7. Student course demand.		7. Matriculated AA degree transfer students from Florida community colleges gaining immediate access to chosen field of study, by institution.
8. An analysis of administrative and support functions.		8. Matriculated AA degree transfer students from Florida community colleges graduating within 2 and 3 years subsequent to institutional admission, by institution.
9. Every 3 years, beginning 1995-1996, an analysis of the cumulative debt of students.		9. Pass rates on professional licensure examinations, by institution and professional field.
10. Evaluation of classroom contact hour production at each university in comparison to a standard of 12 contact hours per term or 32 contact hours per year for each full-time instructional position and the level of funding provided for instruction.		10. Institutional quality effectiveness as assessed by surveys of alumni, parents, students, and employers; and as reported by pertinent national rankings.
		11. Average undergraduate course section sizes, by institution and discipline.
		12. Results of academic programs' attempts at accreditation or re-accreditation.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX B

GOALS CONTAINED IN PUBLIC POSTSECONDARY SYSTEM MASTER PLANS

GOALS CONTAINED IN PUBLIC POSTSECONDARY SYSTEM MASTER PLANS

State University System Planning Directives

1. Improve the quality of undergraduate education.
2. Provide adequate access to undergraduate education.
3. Establish a stable, reliable source of state funding.
4. Develop and implement creative and innovative cost-saving programs to increase efficiency without sacrificing quality.
5. Solve critical problems in a rapidly growing state.
6. Forge public/private partnerships to help achieve state goals.
7. Improve the quality of libraries.
8. Provide quality student advising.

Community College System Goals

1. Preserve open access and increase student success.
2. Strengthen the quality of programs and curricula.
3. Strengthen articulation, cooperation, and collaboration.
4. Establish partnerships for economic development initiatives and strategies.
5. Strengthen the human resources of the community colleges.
6. Strengthen the utilization of technology.
7. Renew Florida's commitment to community college fiscal stability.
8. Strengthen and provide leadership in institutional accountability.

APPENDIX C

STATUTORY REFERENCES FOR ACCOUNTABILITY

Postsecondary Education Planning Commission (240.147, Florida Statutes)

240.147 Powers and duties of the commission.—The commission shall:

(1) Serve as a citizen board to coordinate the efforts of postsecondary institutions in this state and provide independent policy analyses and recommendations to the State Board of Education and the Legislature.

(2) Prepare and submit to the State Board of Education a master plan for postsecondary education. The plan shall include consideration of the promotion of quality, fundamental educational goals, programmatic access, needs for remedial education, regional and state economic development, international education programs, demographic patterns, student demand for programs, needs of particular subgroups of the population, implementation of innovative educational techniques and technology, and the requirements of the labor market. The capacity of existing programs, in both public and independent institutions, to respond to identified needs shall be evaluated, and a plan shall be developed to respond efficiently to unmet needs.

(3) Recommend guidelines for the development of institutional roles, review plans of the postsecondary boards and institutions, and relay these plans to the State Board of Education and the Legislature.

(4) Recommend to the State Board of Education contracts with independent institutions to conduct programs consistent with the state master plan for postsecondary education. In making recommendations, the commission shall consider the annual report submitted by the Board of Regents pursuant to 's. 240.209(3)(r). Each program shall be reviewed, with the cooperation of the institution, every 5 years.

(5) Recommend to the State Board of Education rules concerning the planning and coordination of postsecondary educational programs. These rules shall provide for the sector boards to assure that:

(a) Program reviews are conducted statewide.

(b) Every major program in public postsecondary education is reviewed every 5 years.

(c) Budget requests reflect program review results.

(d) Program decisions lead to the distinctive roles established for public universities and community colleges.

(6) Advise the State Board of Education regarding the need for and location of new programs, institutions, campuses, and instructional centers of public postsecondary education.

(7) Recommend to the State Board of Education for adoption criteria for the establishment of new community colleges and state universities, which criteria shall address:

(a) Proximity to existing institutions and assessment of the impact on existing institutions.

(b) Potential program duplication.

(c) Regional demographic characteristics.

(d) The efficient use of resources.

(8) Recommend to the State Board of Education and the Legislature the establishment of additional branch campuses of public postsecondary educational institutions. No branch campus may be established without a review by the commission and formal authorization by the Legislature. Any community college branch campus established to provide only exploratory, occupational proficiency, job-preparatory, and supplemental vocational and technical instruction must be reviewed and recommended again by the commission and receive specific authorization by the Legislature before expanding its instructional offerings to the college parallel program area.

(9) Review the establishment of those instructional centers which require approval by the Board of Regents or the State Board of Community Colleges.

(10) Review public postsecondary education budget requests for compliance with the state master plan before submission to the State Board of Education.

(11) Assist the State Board of Education in the conduct of its postsecondary educational responsibilities in such capacities as the state board deems appropriate.

(12) Update the state master plan for postsecondary education every 5 years.

(13) Conduct studies and planning activities related to the overall improvement and effectiveness of postsecondary education in this state.

(14) Review implementation of the state master plan and annually report to the State Board of Education and the Legislature the progress towards implementation.

(15) In consultation with the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida, recommend to the Legislature accountability measures and an accountability process for independent institutions that participate in the Florida resident access grant program. The process shall make use of existing information submitted to the federal and state governments. The process shall provide for an assessment of the benefits and cost-effectiveness of the Florida resident access grant program in providing state residents with access to 4-year college programs and with the successful completion of a baccalaureate degree. The commission shall provide oversight of this accountability process.

(16) Periodically review the design and implementation of the accountability processes and reports of the State University System, State Community College System, and public and independent postsecondary institutions. At least every 5 years, evaluate the extent to which each plan is contributing to the achievement of state goals for postsecondary education and report to the State Board of Education, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with recommendations on any changes needed in the accountability process or plans.

History.—ss. 4, 6, ch. 81-182; ss. 1, 4, ch. 82-46; s. 2, ch. 83-268; s. 8, ch. 83-325; s. 6, ch. 84-94; s. 27, ch. 86-301; s. 84, ch. 90-20; s. 27, ch. 91-5; ss. 1, 2, 3, ch. 91-6; s. 4, ch. 91-55; s. 5, ch. 91-429; s. 21, ch. 94-232.

Note.—Repeal granted as s. 240.209(3)(s) by s. 4, ch. 94-322.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

State University System (240.214, Florida Statutes)

240.214 State University System accountability process.—It is the intent of the Legislature that an accountability process be implemented which provides for the systematic, ongoing evaluation of quality and effectiveness in the State University System. It is further the intent of the Legislature that this accountability process monitor performance at the system level in each of the major areas of instruction, research, and public service, while recognizing the differing missions of each of the state universities. The accountability process shall provide for the adoption of systemwide performance standards and performance goals for each standard identified through a collaborative effort involving the State University System, the Legislature, and the Governor's Office. The accountability process shall result in an annual accountability report to the Legislature.

(1) The annual accountability report shall include goals and measurable objectives related to the systemwide master plan pursuant to s. 240.209. The plan must include, at a minimum, objectives related to the following measures:

(a) Total student credit hours;

(b) Total number of contact hours of instruction produced by faculty, by institution, rank, and course level;

(c) Pass rates on professional licensure examinations, by institution;

(d) Institutional quality as assessed by followup, such as analyses of employment information on former students, national rankings, and surveys of alumni, parents, clients, and employers;

(e) Length of time and number of academic credits required to complete an academic degree, by institution and by degree;

(f) Enrollment, progression, retention, and graduation rates by race and gender;

(g) Student course demand;

(h) An analysis of administrative and support functions;

(i) Every 3 years, beginning 1995-1996, an analysis of the cumulative debt of students; and

(j) An evaluation of the production of classroom contact hours at each university in comparison to a standard of 12 contact hours per term or 32 contact hours per year for each full-time instructional position and the level of funding provided for instruction.

(2) By December 31 of each year, the Board of Regents shall submit the annual accountability report providing information on the implementation of performance standards, actions taken to improve university achievement of performance goals, the achievement of performance goals during the prior year, and initiatives to be undertaken during the next year. The accountability reports shall be designed in consultation with the Governor's Office, the Office of the Auditor General, and the Legislature.

(3) The Board of Regents shall recommend in the annual accountability report any appropriate modifications to this section.

History.—s. 5, ch. 91-56; s. 23, ch. 94-232.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Community College System (240.324, Florida Statutes)

240.324 Community college accountability process.—

(1) It is the intent of the Legislature that a management and accountability process be implemented which provides for the systematic, ongoing improvement and assessment of the improvement of the quality and efficiency of the State Community College System. Accordingly, the State Board of Community Colleges and the community college boards of trustees shall develop and implement a plan to improve and evaluate the instructional and administrative efficiency and effectiveness of the State Community College System. This plan must address the following issues:

(a) Graduation rates of AA and AS degree-seeking students compared to first-time enrolled students seeking the associate degree.

(b) Minority student enrollment and retention rates.

(c) Student performance, including student performance rates on college-level academic skills tests, mean grade point averages for community college AA transfer students, and community college student performance on state licensure examinations.

(d) Job placement rates of community college vocational students.

(e) Student progression by admission status and program.

(f) Vocational accountability standards identified in s. 239.229.

(g) Other measures as identified by the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission and approved by the State Board of Community Colleges.

(2) By January 1, 1992, the State Board of Community Colleges shall submit to the Governor, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives a plan for addressing these issues. The plan must provide a specific timetable that identifies specific issues to be addressed each year and must provide for full implementation by December 31, 1994. Beginning December 31, 1992, the State Board of Community Colleges shall submit an annual interim report providing the results of initiatives taken during the prior year and the initiatives and related objective performance measures proposed for the next year. The initial plan and each interim plan shall be designed in consultation with staff of the Governor and the Legislature.

(3) Beginning January 1, 1993, the State Board of Community Colleges shall address within the annual evaluation of the performance of the executive director, and the boards of trustees shall address within the annual evaluation of the presidents, the achievement of the performance goals established in the community college accountability plan.

History.—s. 12, ch. 91-58; s. 53, ch. 92-136.

APPENDIX D

ACCOUNTABILITY REVIEW SCHEDULE, STATE UNIVERSITIES AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES

STATE UNIVERSITIES
ACCOUNTABILITY REVIEW SCHEDULE

1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
FSU (I, Large, Res I)	USF (IV, Large, Res II)	UF (II, Large, Res I)	FAMU (I, Small, MA I)	
UCF (III, Mid, Doc II)	FIU (V, Mid, MA I)	FAU (V, Mid, Doc II)	FGCU (IV, Small, BA)	Summative Review
	UNF (II, Small, MA I)	UWF (I, Small, MA I)		

Key: Institution Name
(Region, Size, Carnegie Classification)

Region Codes: I=Panhandle, II=Northeast, III=Central & East Coast, IV=West Coast, V=South
Size Codes: Small (under 10,000 total headcount), Mid (10,001-25,000), Large (over 25,000)

COMMUNITY COLLEGES
ACCOUNTABILITY REVIEW SCHEDULE

1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
Lake City (II, Small, Voc)	St. Johns River (II, Small)	Chipola (I, Small, Voc)	North Florida (I, Small, Voc)	
South Florida (IV, Small, Voc)	Tallahassee (I, 5-10)	Florida Keys (V, Small)	Lake-Sumter (III, Small)	
Gulf Coast (I, 5-10, Voc)	Manatee (IV, 5-10)	Central Florida (II, 5-10, Voc)	Edison (IV, 5-10)	
Polk (III, 5-10)	Pensacola (I, 10-20, Voc)	Seminole (III, 5-10, Voc)	Okaloosa-Walton (I, 5-10)	Summative Review
Indian River (III, 10-20, Voc)	Daytona Beach (III, 10-20)	Pasco-Hernando (IV, 5-10, Voc)	Santa Fe (II, 10-20, Voc)	
St. Petersburg (IV, Large)	Miami-Dade (V, Large, Voc)	Brevard (III, 10-20, Voc)	Palm Beach (V, 10-20, Voc)	
Broward (V, Large, Voc)	Fla. CC at J'ville (II, Large, Voc)	Hillsborough (IV, Large)	Valencia (III, Large, Voc)	

Key: Institution Name
(Region, Size, Offers Vocational Education)

Region Codes: I=Panhandle, II=Northeast, III=Central & East Coast, IV=West Coast, V=South
Size Codes: Small (under 5,000 total headcount), 5-10 (5,001-10,000), 10-20 (10,001-20,000) Large (over 20,000)

APPENDIX E

ACCOUNTABILITY PROCESS FOR
LIMITED ACCESS COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM

LIMITED ACCESS COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM: PROPOSAL FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PROCESS

The 1995 Legislature, as part of its "Higher Education Access 2000 Act," enacted a limited access competitive grant program "to provide enrollment opportunities for qualified applicants unable to obtain admission to selected state university limited access programs or equivalent academic tracks" (Section 240.6045, Florida Statutes). As directed by the Legislature, the Commission recommended certain baccalaureate programs directly related to high priority employment fields for inclusion in the program. At its August 22, 1995 meeting, the State Board of Education approved the following programs to initiate the grant program for the 1995-96 academic year.

Special Education, General
Education, Mentally Handicapped
Education, Emotionally Handicapped
Education, Specific Learning Disabled
Pre-Elementary Education Teacher
Electrical /Electronics Engineering
Nursing
Occupational Therapy
Physician Assistant
Physical Therapy

The Legislature also instructed the Commission, in consultation with the Board of Regents, the State Board of Community Colleges, the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida (ICUF), and the State Board of Education, to recommend an accountability process for the program. The process is to assess the program's benefits and cost-effectiveness and is to make use of existing information submitted by the respective system in conjunction with the establishment of the program. The Commission proposes the following measures and process.

Proposed Measure	Data Provider	Analysis
1. For each academic program above, the number of students in limited access grant cohort who graduated, left program, or continued to be enrolled three years after admission to ICUF institution. Disaggregate cohort by postsecondary sector of origin.	Institutional research offices provide data to ICUF.	ICUF, in sector-wide Accountability Report. Begin in 1996.
2. For each academic program above, professional licensure examination pass rates of all graduates (not just limited access grant recipients).	Business and Professional Regulation provides data to ICUF.	ICUF, in sector-wide Accountability Report. Begin in 1996.
3. For each academic program above, training-related employment rates of all graduates (not just limited access grant recipients).	FETPIP provides data to ICUF.	ICUF, in sector-wide Accountability Report. Begin in 1996.
4. For each academic program above, the average annual State appropriation per limited access grant recipient.	OSFA provides data to PEPC.	PEPC, in Accountability Review. Begin in 1996.

APPENDIX F

EXAMPLE QUESTIONS FOR USE IN ACCOUNTABILITY - RELATED SITE VISITS

EXAMPLE QUESTIONS FOR USE IN ACCOUNTABILITY-RELATED SITE VISITS

(1) Is institutional improvement seen as the primary goal of the accountability process? To what extent is accountability process perceived as integral to institutional assessment and improvement, rather than as being an "add-on" data compilation and reporting exercise?

(2) How are goals for institutional improvement set with regard to the accountability measures?

(3) To what extent are the following groups involved in institution's planning, assessment, data analysis, and feedback of results—administration, faculty, students, external constituents?

(4) Who on campus receives copies of the accountability report? How is it used?

(5) By what mechanism(s) are accountability data fed back into subsequent planning? How is institutional progress documented? How is progress communicated?

(6) Have state-level entities with funding and policy-making authority to influence accountability provided adequate policy guidance and fiscal support for accountability expectations?

(7) What measures are most appropriate to demonstrate institutional and systemwide performance with regard to state priorities for accountability?

(8) With the advent of performance-based budgeting and other, more short-term, legislative accountability-related initiatives, what is the role of accountability reporting as mandated in statute?

APPENDIX G

SAMPLE INDICATORS OF QUALITY IN UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

SAMPLE INDICATORS OF QUALITY IN UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

A 1995 Education Commission of the States report, ***Making Quality Count in Undergraduate Education,*** summarizes the results of focus group discussions involving political, business, and educational leaders to explore what quality in higher education means and how it can be measured. To virtually all parties from outside colleges and universities, quality resided less in institutional attributes than in student outcomes—attainments most visible after college in "what happens next." Additionally, business and policy leaders generally were far more willing than college and university leaders to advocate straightforward and quantitative indicators of institutional performance.

Participants were asked to offer suggestions about how quality should (or should not be) measured. All agreed the concept is complex and cannot be defined in terms of single comparative measures. Participants outlined several principles that should be used to guide any attempt to assess institutional quality. These principles include: (1) using multiple measures that profile quality along numerous dimensions; (2) using comparative measures across institutions with similar missions and operating conditions; (3) contextual data reporting; (4) presenting information about both absolute outcomes and the educational "value added" by colleges and universities; (5) using external sources of information which provide another perspective and help ensure validity, such as ratings and perspectives of former students and employers; and (6) using mixed measures, qualitative and quantitative, to address both desired student outcomes and institutional attributes.

Specific responses to the question, "What is quality undergraduate education?" clustered around two distinct themes. One addressed abilities and attributes of college graduates. The other embraced particular aspects of the collegiate experience and some specific ways in which colleges and universities, whatever their available resources, choose to "do their business." An example of the kinds of indicators that might be included in a statewide accountability program under the rubric of "quality" appear below.

TYPES	SAMPLE INDICATOR	DATA SOURCE
1. Individual Outcomes		
a. Completion	a. % completing within X time, by demographic group.	a. unit record
b. Job Placement	b. % placed in field, by program.	b. state wage data
c. Further Education	c. % of 2-year starters obtaining 4-year credential (for 2-year institutions).	c. unit record
d. Skills Development	d. % of employed former students reporting that oral communication skills are important on the job and were enhanced by institution.	d. survey
2. Experiences		
a. Faculty Contact	a. Frequency of out of class faculty contact per week.	a. survey
b. Instructional Experience	b. Probability of at least one class < 15 as a freshman.	b. unit record
	Reported alumni/former student satisfaction with instruction provided.	survey
3. Support Services		
a. Learning Support	a. % of new freshmen needing math remediation, by demographic group, and later success in college math.	a. unit record
b. Other Services	b. % of students using/satisfied with specific support services.	b. survey

Source: ***Making Quality Count in Undergraduate Education***. Education Commission of the States (1995).